NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

HUM MEL

Upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M. 1926
hu

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF The Author

June 1926.

Upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M. 1926
hw

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster

28-7

30425

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COURSE IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Submitted by

Margaret Gibson Hummel

(A.B., University of Colorado, 1923)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts,

1926

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Religion - Philosophy
"
Series

30425

378.749
BC
A.M. 1926
hw

O U T L I N E

		Page
PART I	Introductory	1
	A. The Purpose of the thesis.	2
	B. The method of procedure.	
PART II	The Need for a Course in Philosophy of Religion for Undergraduates	4
PART III	Underlying Principles in the Study of Religion	16
	A. General principles	16
	B. Historical Principles in the study of religion	19
	1. The study of the development of religion	19
	2. The comparative study of religion	21
	3. The study of religion as a social process	21
	C. The psychological principles in the study of religion	25
	1. The method of introspection	26
	2. Functionalism	29
	3. Biological Functionalism	29
	4. Behaviorism	31
	5. Self-psychology	33
	D. The Philosophic principles in the study of religion	37
	1. In general	37
	2. Impersonalistic philosophy	41
	a. Materialism	
	b. Neo-realism	
	3. Personalistic philosophy	47
	a. Absolute idealism	47
	b. Personalism	49

Page

PART IV Survey of Courses and Text Books in Philosophy of Religion 53

A. Types of courses offered in Philosophy of Religion 53

B. Survey of Texts 59

1. Caird, John, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion 68

2. Brightman, E. S., Religious Values 76

3. Drake, Durant, Problems of Religion 63

4. Edwards, D.M., The Philosophy of Religion 80

5. Galloway, George, The Philosophy of Religion 65

6. Hocking, W.E., The Meaning of God in Human Experience 62

7. Rashdall, Hastings, Philosophy of Religion 73

8. Sabatier, Auguste, Outline of a Philosophy of Religion 71

9. Wright, W.K., A Student's Philosophy of Religion 59

PART V The Principles for Constructing a Course in Philosophy of Religion 83

PART VI Summary and Bibliography 90

P A R T I

Introductory

A. Purpose:

The purpose of this thesis is to set forth the underlying principles in the construction of a course in Philosophy of Religion for undergraduates in an American college. The thesis does not attempt to prepare the actual course.

There is today an increasing demand for a faith that will stand the test of rational thinking and practical application in everyday living, and that will give, at the same time, satisfaction to the soul that longeth for the eternal "as the hart panteth after the water brooks".[1] The universe, "as a whirlwind, commands each one of us to gird himself like a man and to stand and give answer upon the riddle of the inscrutable three fourths of life."[2] Man has learned that life cannot be separated into compartments and lived according to these divisions. The "fourfold"

---

[1] Psalm XII, verses 1 and 2

[2] Sperry, Reality in Worship, p. 60.

life must be lived altogether at one time, as a whole, and the life of the spirit becomes a pervading element that affects and is affected by all other elements. Religion, then, must meet the demands of life as a whole, in all of its self experience.

Thus the principles underlying a course in Philosophy of Religion should be the principles that demand of religion that it seek to interpret experience in the universe as a whole.

B. Procedure:

It is our aim, first of all, to consider the undergraduate student in our American colleges, with a view to defining the task of philosophy of religion in meeting the particular need of students.

We shall, then, investigate the underlying principles in the study of religion, taking up first the historic principles, second, the psychological, and third, the philosophical.

Following that we shall investigate some text books in philosophy of religion in an effort to discover the principles upon which they are based, their method of procedure in treating the subject, and their value as text material.

Finally, we shall attempt briefly to set forth the principles upon which we believe a course in philosophy of religion should be constructed.

P A R T II

THE NEED FOR A COURSE IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION FOR UNDERGRADUATES

The Student Mind:

There has been a great deal of discussion recently regarding the so-called "student mind". Religious organizations on the campus have especially been wont to take it out upon a research table, tear it to pieces, analyze it, then promptly set up a program which they acclaim as being adapted to the "student mind". They are often completely baffled when they discover, as they frequently do, that after all their careful preparation and sincere desire to serve the student, their program does not seem to have the appeal that they had anticipated. "What do students want?", they cry out in desperation. They go to the student and discover that he either wants something very definite; that he does not want anything at all, or, more likely, that he wants something but does'nt know what it is. Furthermore, he is suspicious; and justly so. He has been inveigled too many times into meetings that attempted to "challenge" him and only dis-

gusted him. And he has wasted too much of his time in courses and discussion groups which only confused his mind, upset old beliefs, and gave no sound basis for a new system of thought. Discussion leaders say that you cannot hope to arrive anywhere with discussion, that you can only start students to thinking. This is all very true, and it is a worthy aim, providing the student continues to think about the matter and has continual guidance in his thought. The chances are, however, that without the latter he will be unable to do more thank think in a circle that, in the end, may drive him back dogmatically to his old belief, lest he find himself adrift with nothing to which he can hold. On the other hand, he may dismiss the matter as something which no one seems to know anything about, and with which he would rather not be bothered. If he is sincere in his thinking, he may find himself helplessly struggling with a shred of truth.

This leads us to classify students into three types, with reference to their thinking about religion. In the first place, there are those who think traditionally. The worth and validity of their thinking depends upon that of their ancestors. Their fathers' religion may stand the stress and strain of

scientific and scholastic bombardment, but if they fear that it will not, they may refuse to relate it. In the second place, there are the avowed agnostic thinkers. They at least are thinking, but they are a bit proud of their supposed superior intellectual attitude upon the subject. In the third place, there are those who are earnestly and sincerely desirous of finding a new and surer basis for belief.

It is this last type of student who is more often found working in religious organizations on the campus, outwardly proclaiming a belief which he cannot adequately defend even to himself. It is this student who is particularly concerned about the relationship between science and religion, the meaning of psychology in religious experience, and the true nature of God, and his relation to the universe. Many students may be more or less interested in these subjects but not all are particularly concerned about them. We do not include in this classification those students who are not thinking at all on the subject, and, furthermore, have no desire to think. It is probably true that they form a large percentage, but

it is very easy to misjudge a student's interest by the type of campus activities that he chooses. He may be more deeply interested than we think, but,being a victim of a college atmosphere, he would not have anyone suspect him of being religious.

In order to understand the situation thoroughly, we should have to go into the whole religious and educational problem of the American university. As this is not the purpose of this thesis, we can only suggest a little of the background which is responsible for this dilemma of student thinking on religion and which should be kept in mind in planning a course in Philosophy of Religion for the undergraduate.

The church tends to blame the college or university for shattering the faith of our young people. The home also blames the university. The general public is inclined to blame the student. The college and university for the most part is not concerned particularly about the matter. The fact of the matter is that all are to blame; the educational system, the home, the student himself, and last, but by no means least, the church.

The church failed to see its opportunity, and has only recently been attempting to nourish the spiritual need of the student. The church should not, therefore, be too quick to condemn the program of non-sectarian religious organizations on the campus which, though they may have inadequately served their purpose, at least have seen the opportunity and the need. The church, however, should more adequately minister to the spiritual need of students. In all fairness to the churches in a college community, it shoubd be said that it is not an easy matter to meet the need of the student and of the older generation all at one and same time. The student has his own special problems, but to be set apart too much as a peculiar type of problem in a community is not for his own, or for the community's, good. The situation is enhanced by the artificial atmosphere and environment of the campus, which makes the problem of the church's ministry an acute one.

If the church has not been quick to see its opportunity on the campus, what has been its contribution to the student before he comes to college? A large percentage of students come from small town

communities where the church, together with the Sunday School, provides the only means of spiritual nourishment. Very often the church is the community center for all social activities. Satisfied with his home church before he started to college, he feels when he returns to it afterwards that it is out of touch with the world and spiritually illiterate. Cyril Harris, a university pastor, in his recent book, The Religion of Undergraduates, made some investigations and found this to be a very prevalent feeling among students. As far as their Sunday School training was concerned, they had been given "little to put into conscious use in college."[1] There were rare instances of the work of some teacher whose life and teaching had greatly influenced the student, but generally, it was the same story of poorly conducted church schools, disorganized smattering of biblical instruction, and no background of belief that would appear to stand the test of investigation. If the church school has inadequately trained the child at the most important period of his life, it is small wonder that the more mature college student

---

[1] Harris, Cyril, The Religion of Undergraduates, p. 5

is so hard to reach. We can never expect to find a student who is very much interested in religion when its chief association for him is an undisciplined and exceedingly tiresome Sunday School class.

We then turn to the parents as a source of providing religious knowledge. It is impossible to make generalizations from such diversified situations as we find, yet it is increasingly true that parents are driven, in the present social organization, to hand over their children to the public schools for educational instruction and to the churches for religious instruction. The result is manifest today on the college campus. As Cyril Harris says, "Spiritual contact between the generations has been lost."[1] He states that parents generally accepted or dared not question the religious thinking current when they were young. To the student today the matter is open for debate. God has often been taught by parents to symbolize "don't". The result is that when these students get to college they have a distaste for what the older generation means by religion. To many students the religion of the older generation

---

[1] Harris, Cyril, The Religion of Undergraduates, p. 6

is neither useful nor intelligible. Parents fail to understand this attitude, and regard it as heresy rather than realizing that the true realities of religion had never been discovered by the student.

Wherein, then, have the college and university been to blame in this matter? Simply in this, that they have failed to see that we must educated the whole mind, body, and spirit of the individual, and not just a part. They have already seen that the physical training of a student cannot be neglected, but they have yet to come to regard the spiritual development of as much importance.

These masses of students in our colleges and universities all over this country are not just mass. They are persons, and the whole personality of each student should be taken into account. If the college unconsciously inhibits the spiritual development of man in its attempt to develop the intellectual side, and gives no opportunity or help to the student in finding the meaning of life as a whole, then it is sinning against the individual and society. "A judgment is upon our universities, that they are sending students forth uncertain still whether they are merely

"thinking machines, possessive animals, or living souls." [1]

Scientific training, however, should help the student to his religious belief rather than hinder him. Philosophy can give him a rational basis for belief, instead of destroying utterly his belief in God. If religion itself cannot stand the test of scientific or philosophical investigation, then any student has the right to claim that it is not worth the having.

We cannot, however, excuse the student from contributing to the causes of his dilemma. Very often his interest is merely argumentative. He would rather argue about religion than think about it. Very often there is much airing of opinions but little evidence of deep thinking or intelligent knowledge of the problem.

However, for the most part, youth usually wants a God, but it wants a rational God; or wants a life more abundant, but it wants help on how to live that life, and not continual censure and blame.

---

[1] Harris, Cyril, The Religion of Undergraduates, p. 30

Youth wants a religion, but it doesn't want it handed down and clamped on with no questions asked. Youth today is more than ever desirous of knowing where and how to serve, and especially for what purpose.

Can we then look to the religious agencies on the campus to solve these problems adequately? If the sgudent goes to his church representative he is more than likely to be given some pamphlets on the needs of the home and foreign field, but there seems to be little aid on how to live a life more abundant as a civil engineer, or a lawyer, or even a mother, and there seem to be fewer suggestions as to how a business man should find his God and worship him. After all, comparatively few students are being reached by the religious organizations on the campus. The courses that have been offered have not had high academic standing, and have not been recognized by the administration. There is too much emphasis on program and social activity; too much broadening of interests; too few leaders intelectually capable of meeting students on their own ground.

Church boards are placing ministers to students on their campuses, and erecting student

centers in an endeavor to meet this need. Yet it is rather hard on the student who belongs to a denomination whose church board has not seen fit to send him a spiritual advisor, and worse still is it when his church sends him one whose intellectual integrity he doubts, and whose interest in him is one of getting him to belong to his own particular fold. Furthermore, there is much overlapping in the program of the different religious organizations on the campus.

We hold that the great need which arises out of this whole situation is for professionally trained leaders in religious education with a college training as a background; and for a combined program of all denominations and religious organizations. It is best exemplified in a school of religion on or near the campus, with a threefold ministry of a recreational, educational and spiritual nature. Ideally it should maintain a beautiful chapel of worship on the campus which would stand as a daily reminder and symbol of the spiritual needs in every life. The program should seek to bring the opportunities of the influence of a home atmosphere to the student away from home, and to afford him the advantage of meeting

in common fellowship students who are seeking the best in life. Finally, such a program should offer courses credited by the college or university which would help the student solve his problems, give him a rational basis for his belief, and teach him how to find and commune with his God. In brief, it should help him to understand life as a whole. Such courses must win the respect of the administration, challenge the student's ability, stimulate his thought, and help him to find God regardless of what his denomination or sect may be.

P A R T III

UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES IN THE STUDY OF RELIGION

A. General Principles:

The college graduate who enters upon the duties of life without some knowledge of the meaning and value of religion has missed something which is essential to living a complete life.

It is not within the sphere or authority of the college and university to dictate to the student what religion is the truest or best. It is, however, within the scope of the college or university to recognize religion as having a fundamental place in the history and experience of the race, and to investigate its validity and value as a factor in life. If it is the aim of the college or university to educate individuals for the whole of life, then a study of religion should be included.

The principles of such a study of religion must be scientific. In other words, the science of religion in our universities and colleges has as much

right and place in the curriculum as any other science. The recognition of this subject in our higher institutions of learning would stimulate the normal growth of religion. In such institutions, with teachers trained for the subject, with adequate equipment for research, and with the insistence on sincere work of a high academic standard, which would naturally be required, the science of religion would develop to its highest degree. The church could never foster its development to such a degree, nor would it be able to dissociate its growth from its doctrinal premises. So far, our American institutions have had a prejudice and a fear against including religion as a science. Meanwhile, investigators in this field can aid in removing this prejudice by the character of the work they produce, and by strict adherence to a true scientific spirit.

There are several possible approaches to the subject of religion. The unscientific doctrinal approach we must discard as inadequate for our purpose. We cannot even include the method of recent theology which is illustrated in the work of James Ten Broeke who enlarges the scope of theology to include the study of one faith in the light of its history, psychol-

ogy, and meaning in the present social world.[1] We are not content with the scientific method and the confining of ourselves to the belief of one particular doctrine.

The study of religion can be made from a purely historical or psychological viewpoint, with no attempt at interpretation of facts. A philosophy of religion, however, must take into account all the facts of experience, hence the principles of history and psychology are important. We shall, therefore, take up a brief account, first, of the principles in the historical study of religion; second, of the psychological principles; third, of the philosophical principles.

---

[1] Ten Broeke, James, A Constructive Basis for Theology, (See Introduction)

B. Historical Principles in the Study of Religion:

One method which we can regard as scientific is the study of the history and development of religion. Such a method of procedure should not be with a view to proving any preconceived religious conviction. Dupuis, an early writer on the subject, made the mistake of reaching his conclusions before entering upon his investigations. He therefore found it necessary to force evidence to prove his theory.[1] There was great value in the method of Hegel, but he erred when he tried to show in the development of religion the determinate stages by which absolute religion is realized.

In the study of the development of religion the purpose is that of discovering the historical facts as they are. The investigator has no power to alter the facts, no choice but to record them. As to the use to which these facts are afterwards put, he has no right to dictate. They may be used for quite contradictory purposes, but the facts themselves remain the same. "We must insist upon the simple fact that the science of the history of

"religion abstains necessarily from assuming either that religion is true or is not true. What it does assume is what no one will deny, viz., that religion is a fact, that it has existed for thousands of years, and that it has a history during that period which may be written."[1]

Such investigation leads to an attempt to determine the principles underlying the development of religion. Such an approach to the study of religion is attempted by such men as Galloway in his Principles of Religious Development, and Cooke, in his Study of Religion. It is less urgent, thinks Galloway, to ask how religion began than why it continues. "Men learn how rich and varied is their inheritance from the past, and see 'writ large' the principles at work which are still active in shaping their own actual experience."[2]

In a study of the underlying principles of religious development such principles are set forth in the hopes that they may better explain its evolution. The danger against which such a method must guard is that of making dogmatic conclusions as to the meaning of religion based on the principles evolved.

---

[1] Jevons, Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religions, p. 5.

[2] Galloway, Principles of Religious Development, p. xv.

The comparative study of religion has been used by some as a method of determining the essential elements common to all religions, and from these to formulate the development of religion. A comparative study of religion, however, should bring out points of difference as well as points of correspondence. The endeavor in the scientific comparative study of religion is not to justify any one religion, but to compare bodies or systems of belief as a constituent portion of the entire life and thought of individuals and their environment. If comparative religion goes beyond this into the interpretation of the differences or the common elements in the light of a particular theory or ideal , it has gone beyond its province. Comparative religion does have an important part to play in the understanding of religious phenomena. It has been introduced with some success in our institutions of higher learning in this country but as yet is not widely taught.

Another method of studying religion is the method of sociology. This method has been neglected as a means of approach to religion. Courses in sociology and social psychology have only casually referred

to religion as a factor in social progress and even as such have failed to give it sufficient recognition.

It is worthwhile for the purpose of our thesis to consider an experiment by Professor Edwin Aubrey at Miami University in the social approach to religion as a method of teaching.[1] He introduced a course in religion as a social process in which he sought to apply the social psychological laws to religion as a social process. He aimed at a scientific attitude and technique with his students. Data for compiling the factors of social causation was furnished by tracing the "life-history" of a given phenomenon so that certain principles might be determined upon for further analysis. Religion thus was dealt with as a social phenomenon. His desire in presenting the course was to stimulate in the thinking of the students an attitude of careful research, scholarly investigation, and a sense of the need of studying religion as a significant complex of social phenomena which a comprehensive sociology cannot afford to evade. He desires that such a

---

[1] Aubrey, "The Social Approach to Religion as a Method of Teaching", Journal of Sociology, January 1926.

study of religion as a social process might come to be a department in our institutions of higher learning. In conducting his class he allowed the student to determine his particular interest and work it out. Finally, these investigations were brought together, summarized, and principles were integrated into a systematic point of view regarding the social process to be reckoned with in an attempt to speculate on the possibilities of a world religion.

In justifying his method Professor Aubrey points out that it reinterprets religious history and religious literature, serves to awaken a wider range of causal factors, calls attention to the social causes and effects which give religion a new significance as an integral part of the social process, and makes it of greater concern to mankind. Further than this, it puts religion on a scientific plane, challenges the student to the best logical investigation, and concentrates attention upon the practical and social bearing of religion.

Thus, the historical study of religion is seen to be the study of religion as a phenomenon in the history of the race. Religion exists as a significant historic fact; it develops in certain ways, and has certain results in the social life of a people. The historian is interested in discovering what common and divergent elements he can find; what developments he can trace; what the characteristics of the different religions are, and what institutions have been established as a result. When he has accumulated these facts, his task as a historian is fulfilled. The philosopher is given the task of interpreting these facts.

C. Psychological Principles in the Study of Religion:

Historical research needs to be supplemented by a study of human nature. If we regard psychology as a study of consciousness, the facts of religious consciousness must be recognized and investigated. There is considerable difference of opinion today as to what a psychological study of religion is, and what its method of approach should be. The only point on which various writers seem to be agreed is in their determination to use methods and resources of scientific psychology in the investigation of religion. There are, of course, certain "religionists" who resent psychologists' invading the field of religion at all. They fear that faith will be destroyed in the analysis. Others, however, welcome the investigations of the psychologists, hoping that faith may be made all the more secure.

There are at present certain well defined methods of studying the psychology of religion. We shall deal briefly with the most important prevailing views. We shall classify them under intro-

spection and functionalism. Under functionalism we shall discuss biological functionalism, which includes behaviorism and self-psychology, which latter emphasizes the function of the self as a whole.

1. Introspection

The method of introspection was the first method used in the study of the religious consciousness. The method is an inductive study into the phenomenon of religion as shown in individual experience. Attention is turned inward, and the person becomes "conscious of consciousness."[1]

The mystic, when he talks about his inner life, is basing his belief on introspection. His method is an unscientific method of introspection. Isaiah's account of his vision in the temple is, in a sense, such a psychological account.

A more scientific method is that used by James, who gathered together a mass of evidence as to the nature and characteristic effects of religion derivable from the biographies and autobiographies of

---

[1] Brightman, E. S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 169.

eminent religious believers or saints. The danger of this method is that the material thus presented often belongs to the region of religious psychopathology. The subjects of experience are taken somewhat too exclusively from the mystical type of religion, and are often exceptional rather than normal representatives of religious thought and life.

It was in an effort to investigate the more normal experience that Starbuck made his investigation from the use of the questionnaire. He made an effort thus, to find out the common elements of religious experience. His method, however, has the limitations of generalizations being made from doubtful and insufficient data, and he deals also with only those whose religion is some form of Christianity.

The method of introspection is regarded by those who adhere to it as a fundamental method of approach. No one else can have your own religious experience, and therefore you are the best judge of that experience. Further than this, other methods of approach, if they are to deal with conscious experience, must necessarily use the introspective method if they are to obtain all the facts. This

method of approach also claims, because of its immediacy in experience, to be more certain than the results obtained from objective observation of behavior.

The method has, on the other hand, the disadvantage of the apparently illusive character of self-analysis. "The very act of becoming conscious of one's own mind changes the state, and may radically modify, if not wholly destroy, it. Trying to catch and see one's own mind is like trying to turn on the gas or electric light quick enough to see the dark."[1] Nevertheless, our own mental states are the only direct and original source we can have, and memory enters in to help us. Without religious consciousness there can be no religious experience. The method of introspection has also been criticized because it has ignored the relation between the mind and body. The introspectionists, however, will reply that consciousness as a fact deserves study on its own account. He will also maintain that especially in the study of religious consciousness the introspective method is essential and fundamental. No matter how we behave, or how other people react, or what the experience

---

[1]Snowden, The Psychology of Religion, p. 22.

means in the history of the race, a religious experience is only of value and has meaning when it is our own, and we are able to study that experience only by the introspective method.

2. Functionalism

There are two directions in which the functional method in psychology has developed. The first method is that of biological functionalism, and the second is that of self-psychology. We shall first turn our attention to biological functionalism in its approach to the study of the religious consciousness:

3. Biological Functionalism:

There are two types of biological functionalism. The first type emphasizes what the religious consciousness has done in organizing the inner life of man in the formulations of his purposes and ideals. The second type emphasizes what it has done in adapting the human being to his environment.

Coe, in his Psychology of Religion, emphasizes the first type of biological functionalism. The method is to ask what one does when one is religious. "This is the first question that the functional psychology of religion has to ask." [1] The first

thing that becomes apparent is that one does certain external things such as going through a religious dance, or going to church, or founding a hospital. The second thing that you notice is that the person acts in a certain moral way, and organizes his life according to certain ideals, or ends.

The second type of biological functionalism asks the question as to what the religious consciousness has done in the history of the race in adapting human beings to their environment. It may seek to determine what has been the function of the religious consciousness in the development of doctrine, cult, and religious customs. It describes the experiences of different races as shown in their prayer life, their sacred prophecies, myths, and religious observances.

This method is used by Stratton in his Psychology of Religious Life. He groups broadly the features of religion and connects them with the acts of mind that give them form, and tries to show that contrasts in religious life are due to differ-

ences in the modes of conduct, thought, and emotions common to a particular group of people.

An extreme type of biological functionalism is known as behaviorism. We shall deal with this method separately.

4. Behaviorism

Behaviorism is an outgrowth of the recent interest and development in the field of biology. There has arisen along with this development a group of psychologists who maintain that the only function of consciousness worth mentioning at all is the biological function. They define psychology as the science of behavior. The extreme advocates of behaviorism are sometimes referred to as "metaphysical behaviorists." [1] They assert that consciousness is nothing more than behavior. E. A. Singer and J. B. Watson take this view.[2] Our sensations, thoughts, feelings, are simply physiological reactions to our organisms, adjustments to environments, or, in other

---

[1] Brightman, E. S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 184.

[2] Watson, Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, p. 9.

words, "consciousness is the motion of matter in space." Frazer, Harrison, and Ames define religion in terms of social behavior.

Behaviorism insists therefore that the true subject matter of psychology of religion is religious behavior. It rejects introspection as a method and makes experiment and observation of behavior the sole method of research. Watson has said, "the time has come when psychology must discard all reference to consciousness and devote itself entirely to the purely objective study of behavior." [1] The study of consciousness he turns over to philosophy. Thus a person cannot talk about religious consciousness and be scientific, according to this school. In fact, it is doubtful if such a thing exists, since one cannot point it out. The only evident thing is one's behavior. Thus, my religious experience becomes a gesture, an utterance, a lifting of the eyes, a bowing of the knee. To call it more than this is to be unscientific. The objections which are raised to behaviorism as a method we shall discuss under self-psychology.

---

[1] Watson, Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, p. 9.

5. Self-Psychology:

We have said that functionalism developed in two directions. We have discussed biological functionalism, and we shall now discuss self-psychology as one development of functionalism.

Self-psychology "holds that conscious process can never be truly described in terms of anything else, even if that something else be so near and so important as the behavior of our bodies. It believes that self-experience is the fundamental fact of conscious life, and that consciousness can never be understood without taking into account the attitudes, the aims, and the preferences, - in short, the functions, - of selves." [1]

Self-psychology should be distinguished from the old "soul-psychology", mostly abandoned, which postulates a soul as "that which" has continuously existing consciousness, even when we are unconscious. This theory is based on a "faculty-psychology". Self-psychology arose from the need of a synoptic theory of consciousness that would take all the facts into account,

---

[1] Brightman, E. S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 183.

and would recognize that conscious states and processes belong together in a unique way. Professor Earl Marlatt of Boston University has defined the self as "an organic whole of reality, a microcosm reflecting the micracosm consisting of a psycho-physical complex organized around a rational, dynamic center, capable of carrying, creating, and perpetuating values." Dr. Brightman has also defined the self as "any conscious experience or process taken as a whole and experiencing itself." [1]

The self, then, has self-consciousness, awareness of meaning. It is space and time transcendent, free, purposeful, developing, responsive to environment, and, most significantly, private. Miss Calkins has said, "When I am conscious of myself, as, for instance, enchanted to meet the President, I am my own personal and private object; that is to say, I am conscious of myself in a peculiar way in which no one else is conscious of me." [2]

Consciousness is not like matter, which has a continuous existence in a process which is only changed and transformed from one state to another,

---

[1] Brightman, E.S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 191.
[2] Calkins, First Book in Psychology, p. 4.

without loss of energy. Consciousness exists in clusters which fade out of existence. There is no continuous existence of these clusters or states of consciousness. Nevertheless, there is something which gives them permanence, and this is the property that consciousness has of experiencing itself as belonging together, and as belonging with a past (or even future) clusters. This fact of experiencing consciousness as belonging together in a unique way is called self-experience.[1]

A person in his religious experience is conscious of his communion with a being beyond and above him in a peculiar way in which no one else is conscious of his experience. At the core of the religious experience is the consciousness of the worshipper as worshiping. Apart from such realization, say the self-psychologists, the experience can have no meaning or significance.

The study of the principles of the psychology of religion leave us with no doubt that religion exists not only as a significant experience in the history of the race, but it is also a fact of

---

[1] Brightman, E.S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 191.

experience in the life of the individual. No matter what the method used in the investigation of these facts, the psychology of religion affirms the presence of religious experience. It may affirm this fact from an inductive method of introspection; or from a study of what one does when one is religious in the formulating of his inner life, which is the method of biological functionalism; or from a study of the objective behavior of the person in his religious experience; or from a study of the self as a whole in its conscious experience, which is the method of self-psychology. Religious experience as a fact is recognized by all these methods. The meaning of the fact is a matter of philosophical concern.

D. Philosophic Principles in the Study of Religion:

1. In General:

Psychology must hand over the final interpretation of religious experience to a philosophy of religion. The latter completes the work of the former by attempting to show the ultimate meaning of the process, and the validity which attaches to religion. A philosophical approach to religion goes all the way with the historian and with the psychologist, but it goes further and asks the meaning and end of all these facts in their relation to each other in the whole. Edwards, in his "Philosophy of Religion" has said that "philosophy, which claims to be the whole apex of intellectual inquiry, cannot rest satisfied with a mere accumulation of facts as such, or even with a more or less complete classification of facts and a grouping of them into coherent systems of phenomena by the discovery of laws of cause and effect, or of unification of sequence which binds them together. The task of philosophy

"is to penetrate into the ultimate meaning of facts."[1]

Philosophy also seeks to interpret and apprehend the ultimate meaning of the "whole" of experience. It transcends particular sciences and contemplates the universe from the point of view of the totality of interests. Man, in his religious life, not only reacts to the totality of things, but he must also at the same time apprehend it. Hence, philosophy in its approach attempts to answer that need. "It is a philosophical inquiry into the nature, function, value, and truth of religious experience; and into the adequacy of religion as an expression of the nature of ultimate reality." [2]

Philosophy attempts to "think truly about human experience as a whole, or to make our whole experience intelligible." [3] The philosopher finds religion as a fact in human experience, and, therefore, it is his duty to interpret these facts, if he is going to consider life as a whole. "Philosophy of religion cannot shirk the task of furnishing a rational ground for the world view implied in religious consciousness.

---

[1] Edwards, The Philosophy of Religion, p. 10.
[2] Edwards, The Philosophy of Religion, p. 12.
[3] Brightman, E. S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 4.

"If it finds at the heart of things a 'heartless,'- indifferent to ethical and spiritual values, hostile to the religious demand, it is its obvious duty to say so." [1]

Thus philosophy,in its approach, must be impartial; always seeking for the truth at any cost, even the cost of religion itself, if its postulates cannot satisfy the demands of reason. It must place its negative as well as its positive findings before the world. "Its only bondage is the authority of truth." [2] Drake also adds in this regard that "the insistence upon irrational views interferes with accurate knowledge." [3]

A philosophy of religion must also take values into account, where the other sciences do not. Hocking has said that"every idea, however rich in practical assocation, is attached in its ultimate 'external meaning' to the idea of reality." [4] The idea of reality, although it has little to do with the beginnings of our actions, has everything to do

---

[1]Edwards, The Philosophy of Religion, p. 12.
[2]Edwards, The Philosophy of Religion, p. 27.
[3]Drake, Problems of Religion, p. 3.
[4]Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p.124.

with the building of their ends. Those ends we call values, but they need explanation in the light of the whole. Philosophy must meet this need. "To see the significance of things trivial is the prerogative of greatness; to see everything bearing upon the whole is both genius and happiness, and it is the joy of religion itself." [1] Furthermore, it is the duty of a philosophy of religion. That which is truly of value is, then, a matter of chief concern. The facts of religion as shown in the history and experience of the race; the facts of religion in individual experience are "means"; the value of these facts are their "ends". Thus, in seeking values it seeks the meaning of reality in all its relations, and religion becomes an inherent part in the unity of life.

There are at present two outstanding and opposing viewpoints in philosophy. The one viewpoint is impersonalistic, and the other personalistic. By impersonalistic philosophy is meant any philosophy which regards reality as something not-conscious. By personalistic philosophy is meant any philosophy which

---

[1] Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 134.

regards reality as being of the same nature as my consciousness of it. Such consciousness may be regarded as a mere succession of ideas, or it may mean a self, or selves as being conscious.

2. Impersonalistic philosophy is materialistic and realistic. Reality is interpreted in terms of matter, and its laws, or in terms of what is neither mind nor matter. "Realism may be defined as the world view that regards reality as extra-mental. That is, it holds to the hypothesis that physical things, and perhaps also universals and values, are entities other than, and foreign to, any mind, human or divine. The true being or source of being in the universe for realism is not consciousness, but something other than consciousness. For realism, in the last analysis, mind is the product of what is not mind; consciousness of the not-conscious; just as the fragrance of the flower appears to be the product of what is not fragrant and its beauty the product of what is not beautiful."[1] Thus an impersonalistic philosophy believes that everything can be reduced to some form of physical reality. Even thought is somehow derived from things

---

[1] Brightman, E. S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 231

or our conception of them. Since science has shown that even the life cell itself is matter, the physiological psychology has shown the dependence of mind on brain, and metaphysical behaviorism has attempted to show mind as motion of matter, the materialistic philosophy feels justified in inferring that consciousness also can be explained in terms of matter and its laws.

One great difficulty involved in a materialistic or naturalistic viewpoint is to determine what matter is. If we believe at all in matter we must believe in the ability of mind to comprehend it, and thus mind becomes again basic. A further difficulty is to explain the fact of unity in the world. The fact of a system and of interaction demands somewhere a basic fact. Again the facts of consciousness are inadequately explained by the materialist. Try as he will, he cannot find consciousness in matter. Our experiences of beauty, truth, love, and sorrow are not material substance.

The new realists of whom Bertrand Russell is one of the chief exponents, explain all reality in terms of neutral entities and their relations. The

method of neo-realism is that of analysis. It holds that the truth about objects of experience must be reached by complete analysis of the perceived objects into their constituent parts until the point is reached where they cannot be reduced any farther.

Thus consciousness is regarded as a mode of objects. One can only understand experience by analyzing it. "For the new realism the presence of the human person in a situation is an incident from which thought can and must abstract; nothing is added to an analysis by the remark that it is the work of a man." [1] Personality has no meaning apart from the relationship of certain "neutral entities". These entities are neither physical nor personal.

Bertrand Russell tells us that man is but a part of a physical world. His body is composed only of electrons and protons which obey the same laws as those not forming part of animals or plants. "What we call 'thoughts' seem to depend upon the organization of tracts in the brain in the same sort of way in which journeys depend upon roads and railways. The

---

[1] Brightman, E. S., Religious Values, p. 192

"energy used in thinking seems to have chemical origin ..... Mental phenomena seems to be bound up with material structure." [1] Russell concludes that since this is true, "we cannot suppose that a solitary electron can think; we might as well expect a solitary individual to play a football match." [2]

The new realism can also give no satisfactory account of religion. Russell finds no place for hope or faith in the universe. Man is nothing but the product of blind, unconscious force, and all his achievements are soon utterly to vanish. In his book, "What I Believe", he says, "God and immortality find no support in science..... I cannot see any ground for either." [3] Religion, he believes, has its source in terror, and its origin is therefore in desire for happiness.

Perry, in his "Present Philosophical Tendencies", is not satisfied with Russell's philosophy of life, although desire is for him also the basis of

---

[1] Russell, Bertrand, What I Believe, p. 4.
[2] Ibid, p. 4.
[3] Ibid, p. 5.

religious development. He denies that there is any inherent value in the universe apart from the interest it has for human beings. There is no spiritual reality; religion is simply faith in progress and in future development. His belief in faith, even in progress, is, however, inconsistent with a strictly analytical method. If one admits faith, one admits something that is not found in an analysis of "neutral entities." [1]

E. G. Spaulding, on the other hand, recognises real values which are eternal and supreme, but exist in themselves and are not dependent on a divine intelligence? [2] Alexander, in his Gifford Lectures, sees the world process steadily developing from stages of sub-human existence to those of super-human. This tendency he calls deity. Deity thus becomes nothing more than an upward urge. [3]

The new realist, however, does not go much further than the materialist in the explanation of consciousness. His "neutral entities" are even less intelligible than matter. If what we regard as

---

[1] Perry, Present Philosophical Tendencies, pp. 334-347

[2] Spaulding, A New Rationalism, (See Brightman, Religious Values, p. 159).

[3] Brightman, E.S., Religious Values, pp. 160-161

our mental life is not something other than brain structure, and organized bodily energy, where can we find a basis for any unity? Can we possibly say that man's mind is nothing other than his brain? "The insufficiency of this argument is apparent. To elucidate the concept of energy solely by appeal to conscious experience, and then to define consciousness as a submerged form of energy is obviously impossible." [1]

When the principles of impersonal philosophy are applied to religious truth, religion finds itself in a precarious position. In the last analysis, materialism must deny a God that it cannot find in matter, and deny the consciousness that is able to find communion with such a spiritual God. The New Realism is also at a loss to know how to account for religion, and its advocates cannot agree on their method. In its last analysis, it repudiates every spiritual or mental ontology. [2]

---

[1] Calkins, Persistent Problems of Philosophy, p. 401.
[2] Perry, Present Philosophical Tendencies, p. 344.

3. Personalistic Philosophy or Idealism

Personalistic philosophy, in opposition to impersonalism puts consciousness at the basis of reality rather than physical things, or universal entities. In method it is also in opposition, since its method is synoptic rather than merely analytic. It therefore can recognize mind, and it regards it as the clue to reality, - a whole which we meet in experience. Personalistic philosophy does not deny matter, but it refuses to affirm that consciousness and matter are the same thing, - namely matter, or universal entities. There are two types of personalistic philosophy which are of particular concern to religion. The first type is known as absolute idealism, and the second as personalism.

a. Absolute idealism regards reality as one single mind. One of the greatest problems of the personalistic philosophy is the problem of the nature, the number, and the relation of the conscious selves. Absolute idealism holds that ultimate reality is, in its innermost nature, a single individual or person,

which differentiates itself into many personalities and objects of the world. "Its central concept is the Absolute Spirit which as spirit conditions the being of its objects, and as absolute, constitutes the superlative fulfillment of every human aspiration." [1] Royce says, "there is but one absolute, final, and integrated self, that of the absolute." [2]

Ultimate reality does not, then, consist in a plurality of utterly disconnected units, but the absolute idealist contends that "underlyi ng and including all the many selves, there is one absolute self which, by its oneness, constitutes their relatedness; and that these lesser selves - accordingly - are only relatively, or partially distinct." [3]

Truth, then, is one organic and coherent system, or whole, since reality is one coherent system. Such a coherent reality could only exist in mind. "Hence the universe is one all-inclusive, all-explaining, wholly rational mind." [4] Idea and object, selves and things, must be included in one experience, myself

---

[1] Perry, Present Philosophical Tendencies, p. 188.
[2] Royce, The World and the Individual, p. 289.
[3] Calkins, The Persistent Problems of Philosophy, p. 420.
[4] Brightman, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 243

and my self-experience are identical. Thus the "Absolute Self and its self-experience are one and the same fact; and that fact is the whole universe of reality." [1]

The objections that have been raised to absolute idealism are, first, that the Absolute Self cannot be reconciled with the finite self. The Absolute Self becomes a paradox of perfection and imperfection, beauty and ugliness, evil and good, ignorance and wisdom, since in finite selves such imperfections exist. Second, it does away with any privacy of finite selves. All are a part of one; then my consciousness is one and the same with my roommate's. Selfhood as a concept thus becomes meaningless.

b. Personalism:

Personalism is the second tendency in personalistic philosophy. It holds that persons are conscious selves that know other selves without becoming identical with them. "Pluralistic personalism is the doctrine that ultimate reality consists in the community, or society, of all related selves or spirits. It is based on two considerations: the

---

[1] Brightman, E.S., Introduction to Philosophy, p. 243

"conviction that the experience of every 'I' is unsharable, and the firmly held conception that any 'I's self-consciousness involves the recognition of distinct, other selves." [1]

Besides this society of selves, there is one supreme self. All physical things exist because of his willing them, and they do not exist apart from him. The case with finite selves is different from that of physical things. They depend on his purpose for their being, but they are not identical with it. "In finite selves the Supreme Person wills the existence of what is genuinely other than himself; so that the universe is ultimately a society of selves, not a single self." [2]

Absolute Idealism and Personalism both start with the coherence theory as the ground for unity and supreme mind, but they differ in including all selves as a part of the supreme self.

---

[1] Calkins, The Persistent Problems of Philosophy, p. 413
[2] Brightman, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 246

Personalism gives new meaning to religious concepts. It emphasizes a personal God whose personality is unique and separate from all other personality. He is the creator of the world-order and of all persons. He is the fulfiller of the ideals of highest values. He took the risk of creating persons who have the power to act and accomplish, or not accomplish, their own purposes, but only in taking that risk was he able to make of personality a true reality. Such a conception claims a God whom persons can respect as moral and as reasonable, and with whom they can have fellowship. Personality becomes the basic fact of the whole of life, and the supreme personality becomes the embodiment of its highest values.

Thus impersonalistic and personalistic philosophy find little common ground in their interpretation of reality. Religious concepts have no valid place in an impersonalistic philosophy, but for a personalistic philosophy in which personality is made the ground of all reality, religious concepts are wrought with new meaning and become a part of the

basic, underlying principles of personalism. Impersonalistic philosophy finds in reality no conscious purpose, no controlling force except the forces of the physical world, or of universal principles, no being to whom persons can lift their hearts in prayer. Idealism, on the other hand, finds something other than matter, other than laws of relationships, or universal entities, and it finds it in a personality that is either one all-embracing and absolute fact in the universe, or in personality that becomes manifest as many persons, with one Supreme Person as the seat of all values.

P A R T IV

TYPES OF COURSES OFFERED IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

A. Survey of Courses and Text Books in Philosophy of Religion:

We have investigated the historical, psychological, and philosophical principles in the study of religion, and we shall now survey the available text books in philosophy of religion in an effort to discover the principles and methods used, and to evaluate the books as texts for a course in philosophy of religion for undergraduates. We shall also consider the types of courses offered in our American colleges.

There are several different types of courses offered in philosophy of religion. The largest percentage were found to be of a historical nature, or dealing with present tendencies in philosophy of religion. The state universities offer such courses. A second type takes up more of the psychology of religious experience, rather than dealing with the subject philosophically. A third type deals with

the subject sociologically, noting its meaning in the social process. A fourth type, found more in denominational colleges, attempts to meet the actual need of the student. Very often, however, it is a course which, in its attempt at simplicity, loses scientific accuracy.

It is evid ent from the survey that there are needed more courses in philosophy of religion for undergraduates which are built on the students' need and experience. Such a course has recently been inagurated in Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. The outline of this course shows that it does deal with the fundamental problems with which students are concerned, but such problems are necessarily touched upon only in order to cover so much ground. This course was given to sophomores in college, but it was found that it was a better course for juniors. Sophomores were not so challenging in their thinking, and were readily confused. The outline of this course follows:

CHAPTER I

THE ROAD TO BELIEF

1. What is religion?
2. Shall we walk by faith?
3. How shall we judge what is true?

CHAPTER II

IS THERE A GOD? --- OBSTACLES TO BELIEF

1. Does the belief in God make a difference?
2. What are the objections to the belief in God?
3. Are these objections valid?

CHAPTER III

IS THERE A GOD? --- EVIDENCES FOR BELIEF

1. The cause of the world.
2. A unitary universe.
3. An intelligible universe.
4. A teleological universe.
5. Human personality.
6. Religious experience.
7. The pragmatic argument.
8. The objectivity of values.

CHAPTER IV

IS GOD A PERSON?

1. What is a person?
2. Is anthropomorphism justifiable?
3. Is pantheism adequate?
4. What kind of a God does the evidence indicate?

CHAPTER V

WHY DOES GOD PERMIT SUFFERING?

1. What attitudes may be taken toward the problem?
2. Does a Finite God afford a solution?
3. Is suffering compatible with belief in a good God?

CHAPTER VI

WHY ARE MEN SINNERS?

1. What is sin?
2. Is man a free agent?
3. Is there a devil?
4. Why does sin exist in a moral universe?

CHAPTER VII

PRAYER

1. What is prayer?
2. Is the practice of prayer worth preserving?
3. What are the objections to prayer?
4. Are these objections valid?
5. What kinds of prayer are legitimate?

CHAPTER VIII

IMMORTALITY

1. Is personal immortality desirable?
2. Is the belief in immortality scientifically tenable?
3. What are the arguments against the belief?
4. What are the arguments in favor of the belief?

CHAPTER IX

THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

1. How does God reveal himself?
2. Is the bible infallible?
3. Is the bible inspired?
4. What is the value of the historical approach to the bible?

CHAPTERS X AND XI

CONVERSION -- THE REVELATION OF GOD IN CHRIST

1. Was Jesus virgin-born?
2. What factors attest his divinity?
3. What is the significance of his death?
4. Is Jesus coming again?
5. Christianity and non-Christian faiths.

CHAPTER XII

RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

1. Does religion need the Church?
2. What is the function of creeds?
3. What must the Church do to be saved?

Chapters IX, X, and XI are out of place in a course in philosophy of religion which endeavors to deal impartially with all religions. Such problems are definite problems of the Christian faith, and should be dealt with under a course in Christian evidences.

A very thorough course in philosophy of religion is given in the School of Theology of Boston University. The course is concerned with the foundation principles of a philosophical interpretation of religion, such as the logic of religious truth, the nature of religious knowledge, the uniqueness of the religious values, and the real as personal. It is given as a two hour course for two semesters. The outline of this course follows:

INTRODUCTORY

A. What is philosophy of religion?
B. Fuller definition of religion.
C. Fuller definition of philosophy.

I LOGIC OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH

A. The meaning of truth.
B. The criterion of truth.
C. Logical method (analytic, synoptic)

II THE UNIQUENESS OF RELIGIOUS VALUES

A. Value-knowledge.
B. Faith and reason.
C. Religious certainty.
D. Verifiability.

IV - THE REAL AS PERSONAL

A. The human person
   1. Characteristics of personality.
   2. Personality and consciousness.
   3. Personality and the Physiological organism.
   4. Significance of personality for religion.

B. The Divine person.
   1. Meaning of divine.
   2. Arguments for the being of God.
   3. Objections to the divine personality.

C. The Divine Person and nature.
   1. Naturalism and supernaturalism.
   2. Transcendence and immanence.

D. The Divine Person and human persons
   1. Divine and human personality.
   2. Persons and physical nature.
   3. Immanence of God in human persons.
   4. Mutual transcendence of God and man.

Second Semester

I PROBLEMS OF THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF RELIGION

A. History.
B. Logical Basis of Social Aspects of Religion.
C. Philosophical interpretation of social aspects.

II PROBLEMS OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

A. Mysticism.
B. Revelation.
C. Prayer.
D. Salvation.
E. Worship

III PROBLEMS OF THE OBJECTIVITY OF VALUE

A. Psychology of valuation.
B. Metaphysics of Value.
C. The problem of evil.
D. Immortality as solution of the problem of evil.
E. Finite God as solution to the Problem of evil.

B. Evaluation of Text Books

1. General Statement:

In general, it may be stated that there are very few books written as text books in philosophy of religion for the undergraduate. Those that are written as such are not altogether satisfactory for the purpose of such a course as is needed. Most of them have valuable reference material. The three types of approach which we have studied are all embodied in the texts, namely, historical, psychological and philosophical. With a view to evaluating the books which are of most value to our course, and in order to ascertain their method of approach, we shall briefly discuss some of the available text material. Our criticisms therefore will be, in the main, based on the value of the book as a text rather than the viewpoint or theory of the author.

2. Survey of Texts:

Wright, W. K., A Student's Philosophy of Religion.

This is one of the few books written as a text which attempts to approach the problem from the

student's point of view, and his need. It has much good historical material, and gives a survey not too detailed or vast. The latter part, which deals with religion and reality, is of greater value as a text, whereas the first part of the book is good for source material.

In his book Wright asks two questions. First, is religion true? Second, what is religion? He then gives definitions of the psychology and philosophy of religion. After this he discusses in their order the different world-religions, the relation of religion to other human activities, evolution of deities, mysticism, religion and reality. Under the problem of reality he discusses mechanism and teleology, biological evolution, psychology, teleology, and dysteleology, and, finally, what the world purpose includes, the evidence of God, the problem of evil, God and human freedom, and the problem of immortality.

Criticism:

Wright justifies a philosophy of religion because religion must be regarded as one of the most important and fascinating subjects for human investigation.[1] It must hold some important and integral

[1] Wright, W. K., A Student's Philosophy of Religion, p. 1.

place in human experience, thinks the author. Such a justification, however, we believe to be inadequate. Just because religion has persisted is not necessarily the reason that it is true. Although Wright also emphasizes religious experience in the individual as a justification of a philosophy of religion, he places more emphasis on the historical significance of religion as a universal fact of experience. Here again we do not necessarily come to believe in religion just because it is a universal experience, but we do come to believe in it as a living, vital experience in our own experience.

The book, however, has a great deal of very valuable material which can be used for reference. It opens up the problems of religion and gives an appreciation of the significance of religion both historically and psychologically. It also has much valuable material on the present tendencies in philosophy of religion.

In general, then, the book is of value as an historical approach to the subject.

Hocking, W. E., The Meaning of God in Human Experience.

The fundamental principle upon which Hocking bases his book is that philosophy of religion should be studied from the human experience of religion. In it he first asks the question, - what does religion do? From this he leads to the question, - what is religion? The first of the book is historical, reviewing the achievements of religion. The second part takes up the motives which have led to the retirement of reason in religion, with a growing confidence in feeling. The issue between reason and feeling leads to a new understanding of the connection between ideas and feelings. The third part of the book builds the idea of God pragmatically, considering what interest we have in the unity of the world, and the presence of anything absolute, and in the existence of a personal deity. The fourth part then deals with the question of how men know God. It shows how God is found in human experience at large, which develops in the specifically religious experience of mankind, The fifth part shows how the two aspects of our spiritual experience develop each other, namely,

the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of men. This is dealt with under mysticism and worship according to the principle of alternation. Part six deals with the work of God in the world, in the way religion becomes fruitful in history, in morals, in the arts, and in the conquest of pain and evil.

Hocking's book is of great value as reference material for specific subjects, such as worship (Part V), and religious value and the idea of God (Part IV). The book treats the matter of religious experience in a very thorough manner. Much of it, I should say the second part, (the issue between reason and feeling) is adapted to the graduate rather than to the undergraduate student.

Drake, Durant, Problems of Religion.

This book is a collection of a series of lectures which were delivered for several years to undergraduates at Weleyan University. It is, therefore, written with the undergraduate in mind. He gives a rapid survey of the field as a whole. His outline is as follows:

PART I HISTORICAL

1. The trend of religious evolution.

PART II PSYCHOLOGICAL

1. The God of experience.
2. Sacrifice and sin.
3. Salvation, conversion, and atonement.
4. Faith and Prayer.
5. Religious love and peace.
6. Essence of Religion.
7. The Christian religion.

PART III PHILOSOPHICAL

1. Theological method and scientific spirit.
2. The interpretations of the Bible miracles.
3. Creation and design.
4. The interpretation of religious experience.
5. Pragmatic arguments.
6. The counter attack upon science.
7. The problem of evil.
8. Immortality.
9. The venture of faith.

Drake's book is well written, but is a little skeptical at times. It is a good book for reference material and for general knowledge of the field as a whole. He puts before the student the conflicting opinions but gives an inadequate basis for judgment between them. The historical data are of value for reference. The parts dealing with Christ and the Bible and the Church are perhaps too theological for a general course in philosophy of religion.

Galloway, George, The Philosophy of Religion.

Galloway, in his text, has made an attempt to keep the facts and movements of religious experience in the foreground, and to discuss the problems of religious philosophy in the light of their historic development. "In the matter of philosophical principles, the author is in general sympathy with the movement called Personal Idealism; and he has learned much from writers like Lotze, Professor James Ward, and Professor Stout. At the same time, it is hard to resist the conclusions that even a monadistic type of idealism requires modifications, if it is to do justice to the realistic implications of experience."[1] The author further feels that a speculative theory of religion must adequately interpret and explain religious experience as a whole. He defines philosophy as "reflections on experience in order to apprehend its ultimate meaning."[2] Religion demands and invites philosophicthought and investigation, since it is a fact of experience and in

---

[1] Galloway, George, The Philosophy of Religion, p. vii.
[2] Galloway, George, The Philosophy of Religion, p. 1.

tendency and outlook closely associates itself with philosophy. Religion and philosophy both seek to present a view of the world and life in which the emotional and spiritual needs of man are satisfied.

The method of the book is evidenced in his outline, which follows:

PART I THE NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION

A. The Psychical basis of religion.
B. The beginnings and growth of religion.
C. Characteristic Aspects of developed religion.
D. Religion, its essential nature and relations.
E. Religious development.

PART II RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND ITS VALIDITY

A. The psychology of religion and the problem of validity.
B. The nature of knowledge.
C. Religious knowledge.
D. Modes of religious knowledge and the problem of truth.

PART III THE ULTIMATE TRUTH OF RELIGION

A. A speculative theory of religion.
B. The speculative conception of a world-ground.
C. Note on the problem of interaction.
D. God: His relations and attributes.
E. God as personal and ethical.
F. The problem of evil.
G. The progress and destiny of man.

Criticism:

Galloway develops his outline very logically in proceeding from the nature and development of religion to religious knowledge and its validity,

and thence to the ultimate truth of religion. He makes his approach from the facts and movements of religious experience, discussing the problems of religious philosophy in the light of their historic development. The material in the chapters on Religious Development (Chapter V), seems to overlap somewhat with his discussion of the beginnings and growth of religion, (Chapter II).

The book as a text will be of particular value in its discussions on religious experience, Chapters I, VI and VIII. The historical data, and the tracing of the development of religious knowledge is well adapted to the undergraduate's need and capacity. Part III, the Ultimate Truth of Religion, also contains some valuable reference material. Thus the book is of greatest value for our purposes in its clear, concise treatment of certain problems to which the student can be referred.

Caird, John, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion.

The principles upon which Caird bases his system are, first of all, that a philosophy of religion should start with the presupposition that religion and religious ideas can be taken out of the domain of feeling, or practical experience, and made objects of scientific reflection. There is a difference between the attitude of philosophy and of religion. The attitude in religion is one of devotion, and in philosphy it is reflection or intellectual apprehension. "In the explanation of religion, philosophy may be said to be at the same time explaining itself." [1] The claim of philosophy to deal with religious truth should not be resisted on the ground that it is impossible for a finite mind to comprehend fully the Infinite. Such an attitude would never make for progress in human thinking, nor would it make possible a fuller comprehension of Infinity. In the second place, investigation should not be resisted on the ground that truth is authoritatively revealed. Such an attitude seems to fear that religious truth

[1] Caird, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, p. 3.

cannot stand the test of investigation. Believing that the claim of philosophy to investigate religious truth reaches to the realm of religion, and that in so doing it explains itself, Caird attempts to justify a philosophy of religion.

The general outline of Caird's book is as follows:

I OBJECTIONS TO THE SCIENTIFIC TREATMENT OF RELIGION

- A. From the relative character of human knowledge.
- B. From the immediate or intuitive nature of religious knowledge.
- C. From the authoritative nature of religious knowledge.

II THE NECESSITY OF RELIGION

III THE PROOFS OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

IV. THE RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS

V THE INADEQUACY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE IN THE UNSCIENTIFIC FORM

VI TRANSITION TO THE SPECULATIVE IDEA OF RELIGION

VII THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

VIII RELATION OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION

Criticism:

Caird, in his book, deals mainly with the objections to scientific investigation of religious truth, and attempts to show the necessity of such investigation. The book was written at a time when such investigation was quite universally resisted. It is too controversial in manner; the problems of religion are not definitely brought out, and for this reason the book is not suited as a text book such as we are in need of for our course.

Sabatier, Auguste, Outline of a Philosophy of Religion.

Sabatier bases his philosophy of religion on psychology and history. His book is written more from a theological viewpoint than from a philosophical viewpoint. Book II deals specifically with Christianity. The author writes with the present generation in mind. He is in sympathy with those who have ceased to repose in positivism in philosophy, utilitarianism in morals, and materialism in art. The present generation, he finds, is interested in the mystery of things; in an ideal social order; and in a program of service to the miserable and oppressed. This he terms a "renaissance of idealism." This idealism is as confused as it is ardent. It seeks a fresh interpretation of religious truth that has not been made evident in the dogmatic teachings of the past generation, but it needs guideance in defining religious truth. "The sages who have led them hitherto bid them take a part either for religion or against science, or for science against religion. They hesitate with reason, in face of this alarming alternative." [1] With these problems of young people

[1] Sabatier, Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion, pp. xiv ff.

clearly in mind, Sabatier endeavors to redefine the meaning of religion in order that it may not be a case of rejecting religion for science. This he does from a historical and psychological approach. The outline of his book is as follows:

BOOK I RELIGION

1. The psychological origin of religion.
2. Religion and revelation.
3. Miracle and inspiration.
4. The religious development of humanity.

BOOK II CHRISTIANITY

1. The origins of the gospel.
2. The essence of Christianity.
3. The great historical forms of Christianity.

BOOK III DOGMA

1. What is dogma?
2. The life of dogma and its historical evolution.
3. The science of dogmas.
4. Critical theory of religious knowledge.

Criticism:

Sabatier's Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion will be of value to our course only as a reference book. Book I is the only part dealing specifically with sections of our course. The author has a sympathetic understanding of the religious difficulties of the present generation, but only deals with a few of them, and these not specifically from a philosophical approach. The book cannot, then, be used as a text.

Rashdall, Hastings, Philosophy and Religion.

Rashdall writes his book from a purely metaphysical standpoint, and does not attempt any historical or psychological account of religion. Briefly, his theory is as follows:

First, ultimate reality is not matter but is utterly unlike anything that we know. It is probably like the mind. God, therefore, must be the universal mind.

Second, there must be, then, in Him the three activities of Thought, Feeling, Will.

Third, what we do not cause, some other must, and nature in its systematic unity implies that this must be One Will. The question then arises, is God a person?

Fourth, the only source of knowledge of the character of God is to be found in the moral consciousness. Moral judgments are valid and reveal the thought of God.

Fifth, belief, then, in the objectivity of our moral judgments logically implies belief in God.

Sixth, if God aims at an end not fully realized here, we have a ground for postulating

immortality.

Seventh, evil must be a necessary means to a greater good.

Eighth, the human mind is not a part of divine consciousness, even though it is in the closest possible dependence on God. Nature in its unity is not self-conscious unity.

Ninth, you cannot base religion on psychological or religious experience without metaphysics.

In the last part of the book he discusses revelation, pointing out that psychological causes of religious belief must be carefully distinguished from the reasons which make it true. He then discusses the uniqueness of the Christian religion which, he says, alone combines an ethical ideal which appeals to the universal consciousness, with a Theism which commends itself to reason.

Criticism:

As a text in philosophy of religion for undergraduates, Rashdall's book would require more of a background in philosophy than the average undergraduate is likely to have. Although, as he states,

you cannot base religion on psychology or religious experience without metaphysics, the student should, we believe, approach his metaphysical account from historical and psychological accounts of religion. In the main, we are sympathetic with his general theory. His discussion of Christianity is related to our subject only from a historical viewpoint, and the book is inadequate as a text for undergraduates.

Brightman, E. S., Religious Values.

In "Religious Values" religion is discussed from the standpoint of religious experience, with a view to interpreting some of its values. It is not the aim of the book to discuss any particular religion, or system of thought, but to consider rather the common human experience of religion in its ultimate significance. It involves, therefore, its meaning to life as a whole. Since this is true, both idea andfeeling are involved, and metaphysical, as well as humanistic, implications must be considered.

Some of the questions which such a treatment of religion must deal with are: Is religious belief reasonable? What are the relations of moral and religious values? How does religion increase the value of life? Is value itself dependent on belief in a personal God? Is true religion positivistic or metaphysical? How do pragmatism, realism, and pluralism value religious experience? Is social service the whole of religion? Do we need mystical communion with God? Why is worship worthful to man?

Can worship survive contemporary doubt? What should be the aim of religious education for the New Age?

In the preface of the book a clear and brief preview of its contents is given. The basic principles of the discussions are brought out in the preface. In brief they are as follows:

First, if religious values are to be recognized they must be interpreted reasonably or understood in relation to our experience and thinking as a whole.

Second, moral values are the basis of religious values.

Third, there is a distinction between real and apparent value. Religion is concerned with the real values which have been tested by their moral and logical validity and their meaning to the whole.

Fourth, there are certain human values of religious experience irrespective of religious belief. Religion meets the need for "unity, for purpose, and for permanence," [1] in human experience.

Fifth, most of the characteristic human values of religion are dependent on faith in a more-than-human God.

---

[1] Brightman, Religious Values, p. 97

Sixth, the question then arises as to how religious experience is to be interpreted intellectually. The meaning of our religious experience must depend "on a real order which is more and other than human life." [1] The positivistic attitude "denies, or abridges nearly everything that is characteristic in religion. Religion is metaphysical; it is a relation to the supernatural. It is supernaturalism, not as belief in arbitrariness, lawlessness, and capricious inventions, but in the more sober sense which holds, negatively, that the realm of nature visible to the sense is not all that is real or that needs to be explained; and positively, that the realm of values revealed in religious experience, is objectively and eternally real." [2]

Seventh, worship is the central experience of religion, and the most valuable.

Criticism:

It is our intention to approach the philosophy of religion from the standpoint of meaning and value and human experience, and therefore this book will be of great use.

---

[1] Brightman, Religious Values, p. 135 ff.
[2] Brightman, Religious Values, p. 136.

The discussions are not beyond the scope of the undergraduate, and are very definitely related to the problems with which he is confronted. We shall be able to use this book as a basis for the part of our course dealing with the meaning of religion in human experience.

The significance of the meaning of religion for the whole of life shall be an important consideration in the course.

Edwards, D. M., The Philosophy of Religion.

Edwards deals with religion historically and psychologically, as well as philosophically. He maintains that we are not in a position to philosophize about religion until we have paid some attention to the study of its history and psychology.

His method he terms as the method of "construction through criticism".[1] He develops his own positive views through a critical survey of certain representative and influential theories. In so doing he lays no claim to independent or highly individualistic work, but endeavors by such an approach to work cooperatively with others.

A study of man, he says, can never be complete unless it includes a study of religion, and, furthermore, the true history of mankind is the history of religion. This conclusion he arrives at from a comprehensive survey of human experience. To science belongs the task of accumulating and classifying facts. Philosophy must interpret these facts in terms of their value for

---

[1] Edwards, Philosophy of Religion, see Preface.

human life. Religion challenges philosophical investigation as a means of making valid its interpretation of truth and reality. This necessitates a philosophy of religion.

Some of the problems which he seeks to solve are: What is religion? What is its nature and functions? Where are we to draw the line between the religious and the secular? How is religion related to other aspects of life and culture more or less akin to it? What is its relation to religion, morality, art, science, and philosophy? How did religion develop to its more comprehensive forms?

The two main problems for his philosophy of religion are epistemological and ontological, and on these philosophy and religion merge. The only difference is in the manner of approach and in the form of the idea. It is, however, more convenient to maintain a separation, even though the problems are the same, since there is an aspect of experience which is distinctly religious. Religion is broader than theology, since theology is related to one particular religion or sect. The only bondage of

religion is the authority of truth. The outline of the book is as follows:

I THE PROBLEM AND SCOPE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

II THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

III THE PSYCHICAL ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION

IV. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION

V THE NATURE OF RELIGION AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER ACTIVITIES

VI RELIGION AND THE PROBLEM OF KNOWLEDGE

VII RELIGION AND ULTIMATE REALITY

VIII GOD AND THE ABSOLUTE

Criticism:

This book, together with Brightman's book on Religious Values and Wright's A Student's Philosophy of Religion, are of the greatest significance for our course. Wright's book is the most valuable from the standpoint of the historical approach. Edwards' book puts forth clearly and concisely the fundamental problems involved. It will be especially valuable for its historical and psychological treatment of religion. The book will serve as a good general background supplemented by Brightman's Religious Values in relation to more specific problems.

P A R T V

THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COURSE IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION FOR UNDERGRADUATES

This thesis has not attempted to construct a course in philosophy of religion. We have dealt only with the principles which must be taken into consideration before such a course can be constructed. We have investigated the methods of procedure of various books in philosophy of religion, and have made suggestions as to their value as text books for a course in philosophy of religion. We shall now attempt to suggest some of the fundamental principles which, as a result of the foregoing investigation, we believe should underlie the actual construction of a course in philosophy of religion.

First of all, the course should meet the need of the undergraduate who is unable to adjust his religious conceptions to the new truths with which he is confronted in his college courses. Second, it should meet the need of the student who is thinking dogmatically, and with prejudice, and

supplant this attitude with an attitude of scholarly investigation and research. Third, it should stimulate interest for religion in those students who have been unwilling to seek its meaning or value, or who have been indifferent toward it. For all students such a course should set forthguiding principles by which they can test the validity of religious truth; it should interpret the facts of religious experience as a whole, and show their implications for the meaning of ultimate reality. Although it can never hope to solve all their problems, it can give them courage to go forth in quest of something better than this is, and with more certainty that the world is not indifferent to values, and that the quest for truth is heroic and brings its own joy in the striving. It can also teach them that nothing should be proclaimed as truth until all the facts have been taken into account. Such a course should give them the ability to assimilate and interpret further experience in the light of the basic principles which have been considered.

In our investigation of text books in philosophy of religion, we found that as a rule they

have been limited to one aspect of religious experience, such as the historical or psychological aspects. We see the need for a philosophy of religion that will take the whole of experience into account in its interpretation.

A course in philosophy of religion must first investigate the facts before it has any right to attempt an interpretation of those facts. Without the facts, its postulates would be nothing more than mere hypotheses and fancy. We believe, then, that the facts of the history of religion should be investigated. Such investigation will enable the student to discover the meaning of religion in the history and development of the race. Common and divergent elements will be pointed out, its effect on social life and institutions will be observed, and the different forms which have evolved will be discovered. Thus religion as a vital fact of history will be firmly established, and the obligation of the philosopher to interpret such a vital fact in the history of mankind becomes all the more important.

The history of religion should logically precede the study of the psychology of religion.

History shows religion to be a fact of experience, and the psychology of religion investigates the experience itself. The psychology of religion must rely on the history of religion to make valid an investigation of religious experience.

The next consideration of the course should be the investigation of the facts of psychology of religious experience. Such investigation brings out the fact of experience as basic in religion, and the obligaction to interpret this experience in the light of experience as a whole is realized. Thus, through the study of the facts of the psychology of religion, the student has a basis for further interpretation of these facts and their implications.

The mere accumulation of facts is not enough. It is only the background and foundation upon which the rest of the course should be built. A course in philosophy of religion should primarily seek to interpret facts. In his college career the student's mind is overloaded with facts, and he has not therefore trained his ability to find the meaning of these facts. He therefore needs guidance

and help. The course should help him to develop this ability to interpret facts.

Having then presented the facts, the next step is, of course, to discover the implications, the significance, the meaning of such facts. In brief, the ultimate meaning of religion in relation to the universe as a whole is the task before the student. The problems involved must be raised before the solutions can be given. The understanding of any fact philosophically involves first of all what the nature of the problem is, and then its relations to all other facts. The ultimate aim of the student should be to arrive at some definite conclusions, but such conclusions are of no value unless all the implications of the problem are first raised, and all taken into consideration in building up, step by step, the true conclusion.

The course must therefore discover how we can determine truth, and then find the meaning of religious truth. It must discover the nature of religious knowledge, the meaning of religious value, the implications of personality, the nature of God, and His relation to the universe and to persons.

These considerations give rise to certain well defined problems, and the course should seek to help the student solve his problems regarding the nature of sin and evil, the meaning of immortality, the meaning of prayer and worship, the finding of purpose in the universe. Finally, we believe that a philosophy of religion should give the student a working hypothesis for his life as a student on the campus, and as a citizen of the world, and such a philosophy of life will enable him continually to search for a life more abundant.

Such a course should aim to find the fundamental issues, and to state them clearly so that undergraduates can comprehend them. This should be done without loss of scientific accuracy. The course should fulfill high scholastic standards, and challenge the best thinking of the students. Assignments for outside reading should be made on the different divisions of the course, and reports should be required. Some time should be given to discussion, although the course should be primarily a lecture course. The need and experience of the undergraduate should always be kept in mind, and made the basis for the method of procedure.

Thus we believe that we should introduce more courses in philosophy of religion in our American colleges. Such courses should be given by instructors of high academic standard who have specialized training in this particular field. Such courses should not attempt to set forth one theory as the only absolute and true theory, but should leave the student free in the light of his own knowledge to accept the principles which seem to him to satisfy the test of coherence.

P A R T VI

SUMMARY

The thesis has attempted to set forth some of the principles underlying the construction of a course in philosophy of religion. First of all we have maintained that a course in Philosophy of Religion should meet the need of the student in our American colleges. The student needs are specialized since his college courses and environment are peculiar. There is a need for more courses in philosophy of religion which take into account the specialized student problem. A knowledge of the religious background and training is therefore important; and a sympathetic insight into the present life and thought of the student is necessary. Furthermore, such a course should be constructed to meet high standards of scholarship, and should be regarded by the student as a course on a par with his other academic work, and worthy of his best intellectual effort.

In the second place, we took up the principles underlying the study of religion and classified them as historical, psychological, philosophical. In the historical study of religion we maintained that all investigation of religion as a fact of history should be made in a true scientific spirit. The facts should be investigated as they are and should not be made to fit into any preconceived theory of development. The history of religion is under obligation to state a fact no matter what its implications for the truth of any religious sect or doctrine. The underlying principle in the study of religious history is to determine religion as a fact in the history and development of the race. The history of religion must precede the philosophy of religion, since the facts must be established before it is possible to investigate their meaning.

The psychology of religion must also be studied in the same unprejudiced and scientific spirit in which the history of religion is studied. Functional psychology, we maintained, could be classified into two main and opposing schools of thought, namely

biological functionalism, which includes behaviorism, and self-psychology, which takes the coherent whole of experience into account. We have upheld the principles of self-psychology, but have endeavored also to see what values there are in other schools of thought, and to give them their just due and consideration. We maintain that before a student can interpret the meaning of religious experience he must understand just what is meant by religious experience, and what has been the experience of the race in regard to it. We believe that religious experience has been established as an important factor in the whole of experience, and must therefore be investigated. We believe that psychology can aid the philosopher in understanding the meaning of this religious experience for ultimate reality.

In the philosophic principles in the study of religion we found two main and divergent points of view, namely personalistic and impersonalistic philosophy. Personalistic philosophy regards reality as being of the same nature as my consciousness of it. Impersonalistic philosophy is material-

istic or realistic and regards consciousness as something not-conscious.

We believe that any philosophy which does not take the whole into account, defeats its own end. A true philosophic approach to the study of religion goes all the way with the historical and psychological study, but goes further and determines the ends of causes and conditions, and that in doing this, it should endeavor to make the whole of experience intelligible.

The fourth division of ou r thesis was an attempt to survey the types of courses given in our colleges, and also to evaluate some books in philosophy of religion which might be suitable for text books in philosophy of religion. We found that few books were written as texts for college students. Many of them contained valuable reference material. The books which we recommended for use as text books were Edwards' Philosophy of Religion, and Brightman, Religious Values. We believe that these two books can be used to advantage to supplement each other. We also recommend Wright's A Student's Philosophy of Religion as valuable in its historic approach.

In the fifth division of our thesis, we anticipated a course in philosophy of religion based on the principles we had discussed. We therefore briefly gave some of the principles in the actual construction of such a course. We proposed that such a course should begin by investigating first the facts of the history of religion; second the facts of psychology of religion; third, it should raise metaphysical problems in regard to these facts; and,finally, it should aim at conclusions reached through a study of all the facts in all their relations.

The thesis has not attempted to give the outline of a course, or to work out the actual construction of it. The aim has been to give the principles which are necessarily to be considered as a basis for such a course.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aubrey, Edwin E., "The Social Approach to Religion as a Method of Teaching", The Journal of Religion, Volume VI, No. 1, pp. 78-89.

Bowne, Borden Parker, Personalism, Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1908.

Brightman, E. S., An Introduction to Philosophy, Henry Holt, 1925.

Brightman, E. S., Religious Values, The Abingdon Press, N. Y., 1925.

Bruce, W. S., The Psychology of Christian Life and Behavior, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1923, pp. 1-10.

Caird, John, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, Macmillan & Co., 1880

Caldecott, Alfred, The Philosophy of Religion in England and America, Macmillan & Co., N.Y. 1901, pp. 1-15.

Collingwood, R. G., Religion and Philosophy, Macmillan & Co., 1916, pp. 1-24.

Calkins, Mary, Persistent Problems of Philosophy, Macmillan & Co., 5th Edition, 1925, pp. 1-14.

Calkins, Mary W., A First Book in Psychology, N.Y., Macmillan Co., 1914.

Clark, Glenn, The Soul's Sincere Desire, Atlantic Monthly Press, 1925.

Coe, George Albert, Spiritual Life, Eaton and Mains, 1900, pp. 1-14; 59-76.

Drake, Durant, Problems of Religion, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1916, pp. 1-19; 312, 321.

Edwards, David M., The Philosophy of Religion, George Doran, 1924.

Galloway, George, The Philosophy of Religion, N.Y., Scribner's Sons, 1914.

Galloway, George, Principles of Religious Development, London, Macmillan Co., 1909, pp. xv-xx; 1-98.

Harris, Cyril, The Religion of Undergraduates, N.Y., Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Herman, Elizabeth, Creative Prayer, London, James Clark & Co., Ltd., 1921.

Hinton, James, Philosophy and Religion, Hegan Paul and Company, London, pp. 1-15.

Hocking, W. E., The Meaning of God in Human Experience, Yale University Press, 1912, pp. 3-226.

Hoffding, Harold, The Philosophy of Religion, London, Macmillan & Co., 1906, pp. 1-13.

Jacks, L. P., Religious Perplexities, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Jastrow, Morris, The Study of Religion, London, Scott, 1902, pp. 1-57; 273-304; 351 ff.

Jevons, Frank B., An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion, N.Y., Macmillan & Co., 1908, pp. 1-33.

Knudson, Albert C., Present Tendencies in Religious Thought, N.Y., Abingdon Press, 1924, pp. 1-40; 190-200.

Leighton, Joseph Alexander, Religion and the Mind of Today, N.Y., D. Appleton & Co., 1924, pp. 3-14.

McConnell, F. J., Is God Limited, Abingdon Press, 1924.

Perry, Ralph Barton, Present Philosophical Tendencies, N.Y., Green Longmans Co., 1921.

Pfleiderer, Otto, Philosophy and Development of Religion, N.Y., G.P.Putnam's Sons, Vol. I, pp.1-36.

Pratt, James Bissett, The Religious Consciousness, Macmillan Co., 1923, pp. 22-40.

Rashdall, Hastings, Philosophy and Religion, N.Y., Scribner's Sons., 1910.

Royce, Josiah, The World and the Individual, N.Y., Macmillan & Company, 1900-1901, pp. 1-30.

Sabatier, Auguste, Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion based on Psychology and History, N.Y., James Pott & Co., 1897, pp. 1-31.

Snowden, James H., The Psychology of Religion, N.Y., Fleming H. Revell Co., 1916, pp. 17-26.

Sorley, W. R., Moral Values and The Idea of God, The Macmillan Company, N.Y., 1924.

Spaulding, Edward G., The New Rationalism, N.Y., Henry Holt & Co., 1918, (See Brightman, E.S., Religious Values, p. 159).

Sperry, Willard L., Reality in Worship, N.Y., The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Starbuck, Edwin D., The Psychology of Religion, London, Scott, 1899, p. 1-10.

Stratton, Psychology of Religious Life, N.Y., The Macmillan Company, 1918, pp. 1-18.

Strickland, Francis L., Psychology of Religious Experience, N.Y., Abingdon Press 1924, pp. 11-84.

Ten Broeke, James, A Constructive Basis for Theology, The Macmillan Co., 1914, pp. 1-10.

Watson, John B., Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1919, p. 1-23.

Wilm, E. C., Problem of Religion, Abingdon Press, 1922, pp. 1-25.

Wright, W. K., A Student's Philosophy of Religion, The Macmillan Company, N.Y., 1922, pp. 1-7; 407-411.

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster

28-7

NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02487 4374